

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
EARL WARREN HALL
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

May 13, 1960

cf. interview of 5/12

Mr. Henry P. Anderson
1820 Ramona
Stockton, California

Dear Henry:

Thank you for coming down so promptly to discuss the manuscript of your study, "The Bracero Program in California, with Particular Reference to Health Status, Attitudes, and Practices," dated April, 1960.

There is attached a list of things to be done in connection with the revision of the preliminary draft. A good many of these we can get well underway prior to the meeting of the Advisory Committee.

Upon giving the matter further thought, and after discussing it with a few other people, I feel it necessary to underscore the absolute necessity of avoiding any unauthorized distribution of copies of this preliminary draft. As it now stands, it is a potentially libelous document in which not only you as author are involved but, inadvertently, you have involved the members of the Advisory Committee and me by listing our names as you have in this document. There is nothing wrong with having potentially libelous material appear in working copies pending necessary clearance, corrections, deletions, etc. The mistake in this case is that the document is not clearly labeled as confidential; that so many copies have been run; and that it may, therefore, be difficult to prevent inadvertent distribution. Because of this I am now asking you to return to me all undistributed copies, retaining only two or three clearly marked preliminary copies for which you will remain individually responsible. Those few copies that you have distributed to persons other than the Advisory Committee should be followed up, as you suggested, by a letter from you which should be sent immediately, explaining the preliminary nature of this material and requesting its return to you, and from you to me, after it has been reviewed. The form in which the material is presented makes this legally an absolute necessity. Also, to assure protection of those concerned, I wish you to send me carbon copies of all correspondence in this matter. You will understand, I am sure, that these procedures are no reflection upon you but are simply necessary safeguards in terms of the personal interests of those involved.

Lest this all seems to be in a critical tone, may I restate, as I did yesterday, that there is a tremendous amount of very interesting and valuable material in your report and I am sure that, working cooperatively and intensively for the next few months, we will be able to produce a document of which we will all be proud.

Sincerely,

Edward S. Rogers
Edward S. Rogers, M.D.

Enc.

Proposed changes in first draft (dated April 1960)

On the basis of my preliminary review of your manuscript and our discussion of May 12, it is understood that the following revisions will be undertaken, as many of them as possible prior to the Advisory Committee meeting on May 27.

1. All of Chapter 13, in its present form, will be deleted. In its place will be substituted an expanded outline (later to be developed as a full chapter) which will review the findings of the study in terms of our initial purpose, namely: To focus strictly on the effects of the bracero program on the health status, attitudes and practices of the Mexican Nationals concerned. To review, to the extent appropriate, the methodological procedures employed in terms of the use of quantitative technics in a study of this kind.

2. I shall undertake to employ a part-time editor, competent in terms of knowledge in this broad field, to go over the manuscript for the purpose of general editing, removing redundancies and irrelevant materials where they appear and, particularly, for the purpose of deleting those references to political action which are interspersed to some extent throughout the first twelve chapters and brought to a climax in your development of Chapter XIII. This whole subject area and the thesis which you have developed in connection with it is a matter requiring independent treatment and is not an appropriate focus for this study.

3. All quoted materials, even when the quotation is indirect, as indicated by "bracero" or "supervisor" or "grower interviewed on such and such a date", etc., must be reviewed by a competent and legally informed editor on the use of such materials. Where persons are identified, specific permission to quote must be obtained in writing.

4. Another point in the interesting use that you make of quoted interviews is the question of possible bias in the selection of presented materials. This should be reviewed and the necessary qualifying statements added to the text to explain how the various selections were made. The use of testimonial materials of this kind is obviously valuable but, at the same time, the reader is unable to evaluate the possibility of bias unless the basis upon which the selection is made is very meticulously indicated. For example, you told me that a large part of the general interviewing was done in areas considered to be representative of high standard growers and with camps well above average. It would be important to indicate the basis upon which this judgment rests.

5. I believe that you recognized the basis for the question which came from one of the Advisory Committee members concerning the varying "n's" in your tabulations. As the matter stands the data leave the reader entirely in the dark as to what happened to the people not reported in each table and what the basis might have been for selecting those who were reported.

6. In the attached letter I have already commented on the necessity of marking all of these copies "preliminary working document--not for publication or reproduction."

5/13/60